

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, and 16-19 have been amended. New claims 21-25 have been added. As a result, claims 1-25 are pending for examination with claims 1, 16, 19 and 21 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 17-18 were objected to for various informalities. In response, Applicant has amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions, and therefore, the objections should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as it is alleged in the Office Action that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although the Applicant does not concede to this rejection, clarifying amendments to the independent claims produce a tangible and concrete result. For instance, in the amended claim 1, a method is provided comprising an act of "generating and sending an alert message to a user," which is a useful, tangible result. Independent claim 16, as amended, recites "storing, in a storage device in a monitoring computer, an indication," which is a tangible result. Further, independent claim 19, as amended, recites "storing the list of nameservers in a memory of a monitoring computer system." Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by DNS and BIND by Paul Albitz and Cricket Liu, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc. Copyright 1992 (hereinafter "Liu"). In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims and submits the following remarks.

Liu is directed to the conventional DNS system. Liu is referenced in the Background section of the instant Application (located on Pages 1-2 of the instant Application), and describes a conventional configuration and function of nameservers typically used in the Internet and enterprises for resolving names to IP addresses.

By contrast, independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for locating a discrepancy in mapping information that maps an identifier to a particular resource, the method comprising acts of determining a first mapping, determining a second mapping, comparing the first mapping to the second mapping and identifying at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping; and generating and sending an alert message to a user, the alert message indicating the at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping.

Liu does not disclose that which is recited in claim 1, as amended. In particular, Liu does not disclose “generating and sending an alert message to a user, the alert message indicating the at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping,” as recited in claim 1, as amended. As discussed and admitted by the Examiner in Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, Liu only discloses a manual interface for troubleshooting a DNS configuration (e.g., nslookup invoked in a command line interface). With respect to what types of issues Liu permits a user to troubleshoot, Liu is silent, and simply refers to troubleshooting DNS issues. Liu does not, in contrast to the alleged interpretation, disclose identifying at least one discrepancy between the first and second mapping as recited in claim 1. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended claim 1 to be more clear, and to recite that an alert message indicating the discrepancy is generated and sent to a user. As appreciated by the Applicant, there is no automated system for alerting an administrator to mapping discrepancies in a domain name system. As discussed in the instant Application on Page 15, lines 25-26 “[a] compromise of [a] nameserver 706 may go undetected until noticed by a network administrator, which may be a long period of time.” Thus, the “manual” method for troubleshooting domain name server issues is inferior, as long periods of time may elapse between the actual occurrence of a discrepancy and the detection using an alleged “manual” method. Liu sends no such alert message. At most, Liu permits a user to troubleshoot DNS issues in a manual command line interface. Therefore, Liu does not disclose that which is recited in claim 1, as amended, and the rejections should be withdrawn. Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claim 16

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites a method for discovering nameservers, comprising acts of sending a namespace mapping resolution query to a plurality of network nodes, waiting for one or more responses from at least one of the network nodes, determining

whether a network node in the plurality of network nodes is a nameserver, and storing, in a storage device in a monitoring computer, an indication that the network node is a nameserver in response to the act of determining.

Liu does not disclose that which is recited in claim 16, as amended. In particular, Liu does not disclose “storing, in a storage device in a monitoring computer, an indication that the network node is a nameserver in response to the act of determining” as recited in claim 16, as amended. In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that claim 16 is allegedly anticipated by a zone transfer, which is used to transfer address records between nameservers. In response, Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite that the indication that the network node is a nameserver is stored in a monitoring computer. Liu does not disclose, teach or suggest discovery of nameservers and storing of indication that a network node is a nameserver in a monitoring computer. Thus, claim 16 as amended is not anticipated by Liu, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 17-18 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claim 19

Independent claim 19, as amended, recites a method for discovering nameservers, comprising acts of listening for a request from a non-authoritative nameserver to an authoritative nameserver, when the request is detected, adding the non-authoritative nameserver to a list of nameservers; and storing the list of nameservers in a memory of a monitoring computer system.

Liu does not disclose that which is recited in claim 19, as amended. In particular, Liu does not disclose “adding the non-authoritative nameserver to a list of nameservers; and storing the list in a memory of a monitoring computer system,” as recited in claim 19, as amended. In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that claim 19 is allegedly anticipated by caching of nameserver responses. In response, Applicant has amended claim 19 to recite “storing the list in a memory of a monitoring computer system.” As discussed above with respect to claim 16, Liu does not teach or suggest discovery of nameservers, nor does Liu teach a monitoring computer that stores a list of discovered nameservers. For at least these reasons, Liu does not anticipate claim 19 as amended. Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 21-25 were added to further define Applicant’s contribution to the art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerald R. Malan, Applicant

By: /Edward J. Russavage/
Edward J. Russavage, Reg. No. 43,069
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
United States of America
Telephone: 617-395-7000
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Docket No.: A0781-701810
Date: November 5, 2007